arXiv:1605.03372v1 [math.DG] 11 May 2016

ALGEBRAIC NON-INTEGRABILITY OF MAGNETIC BILLIARDS

MISHA BIALY AND ANDREY E. MIRONOV

Abstract. We consider billiard ball motion in a convex domain of the Euclidean plane bounded by a piece-wise smooth curve influenced by the constant magnetic field. We show that if there exists a polynomial in velocities integral of the magnetic billiard flow then every smooth piece γ of the boundary must be algebraic and either is a circle or satisfies very strong restrictions. In particular in the case of ellipse it follows that magnetic billiard is algebraically not integrable for all magnitudes of the magnetic field. We conjecture that circle is the only integrable magnetic billiard not only in the algebraic sense, but for a broader meaning of integrability. We also introduce the model of Outer magnetic billiards. As an application of our method we prove analogous results on algebraically integrable Outer magnetic billiards.

1. Introduction and main results

1.1. **Birkhoff magnetic billiards.** In this paper we consider magnetic billiard inside a convex domain Ω bounded by simple piece-wise smooth closed curve. We consider the influence of the magnetic field of constant magnitude $\beta > 0$ on the billiard motion, so that the particle moves inside Ω with unite speed along Larmor circle of constant radius $r = \frac{1}{\beta}$ in a counterclockwise direction. Hitting the boundary the particle is reflected according to the law of geometric optics. We call such a model – Birkhoff magnetic billiard.

We shall assume that every smooth piece γ of the boundary of Ω satisfies

$$\beta < \min_{\gamma} k,$$

where k is the curvature. In other words we assume that the magnetic field is relatively week with respect to the curvature. It is an exercise in differential geometry of curves that in this case the boundary of the domain Ω is strictly convex with respect to circles of radius $r = \frac{1}{\beta}$. This means in particular that intersection of any circle of radius r with the domain consists of at most one arc. Moreover, under this assumption, if a circle of radius r oriented in the same direction as the boundary is tangent to $\partial\Omega$ (with agreed orientation) then it contains the domain Ω inside. Birkhoff magnetic billiards were studied in many papers: [1], [2], [8], [11], [13], [15], [18], [20].

Motivation for the present paper comes from [15] where computer evidence of chaotic behavior of magnetic billiard inside ellipse is demonstrated for all

Date: April 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37J40,37J35.

Key words and phrases. Magnetic Billiards, Polynomial Integrals, Birkhoff conjecture.

M.B. was supported in part by Israel Science Foundation grant 162/15 and A.M. was supported by Supported by RSF grant 14-11-0044.

magnitude of magnetic fields. For β positive, unlike the case $\beta = 0$, the pictures show that the billiard is not integrable. We examine this problem in algebraic setting using the ideas from our recent papers on usual Birkhoff billiards [3], [4] extending previous results of [5] and [19].

It seems plausible that other approaches for integrability might be applicable. For example, it is interesting to test meromorphic integrals via variational equations along 2-periodic orbit (see Fig. 1) in the spirit of [14].



Fig. 1 2-periodic orbit inside Ω, $\partial\Omega = \gamma$.

1.2. **Polynomial Integrals.** We shall study the existence of Polynomial in velocities integral for magnetic billiards.

Definition 1.1. Let $\Phi : T_1\Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function on the unite tangent bundle, $\Phi = \sum_{k+l=0}^{N} a_{kl}(x)v_1^k v_2^l$, which is a polynomial in components of v with continuous coefficients up to the boundary, $a_{kl} \in C(\overline{\Omega})$. We call Φ a polynomial integral of the magnetic billiard if the following conditions hold.

1. Φ is an integral of magnetic flow g^t inside Ω,

$$\Phi(g^t(x,v))) = \Phi(x,v);$$

2. Φ is preserved under the reflections at smooth points of the boundary: For any smooth point $x \in \partial\Omega$,

$$\Phi(x,v) = \Phi(x, v - 2 < n, v > n),$$

for any $v \in T_x\Omega, |v| = 1$, here (v,n) positive orthonormal basis.

Remark 1. It appears that the condition of convexity with respect to the circles of radius r which we introduced above can be relaxed if one adds in the Definition 1.1 of the integral the following requirement: For any given circle of radius r intersecting the domain Ω in several arcs, the integral Φ is required to have the same value on all the arcs of the intersection with Ω. Our method strongly relies on this additional requirement and it is not clear to us if it is really necessary.

Example 1. Let γ be a circle with the center at the origin. Then the function which measures the distance to the origin of the center of Larmor circle remains unchanged under the reflections and hence is the integral of

the billiard flow. So the integral h in this case has the form:

$$h(x,v) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \frac{2}{\beta}(v_1x_2 - v_2x_1).$$

In fact, we are not aware of any other piece-wise smooth example of integrable magnetic billiard. Similarly to Birkhoff' conjecture for usual billiard we ask if the only integrable magnetic billiard is circular. As usual the integrability can be understood in various ways. In this paper we study Polynomial in velocities integrals for magnetic billiards. Another approach of *Total* integrability was considered in [2].

1.3. **Phase Space of Magnetic billiard.** We shall use throughout this paper the following construction. Denote by J the standard complex structure on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and introduce the mapping:

$$\mathcal{L} : T_1\Omega \to \mathbb{R}^2,\ \mathcal{L}(x,v) = x + rJv, \tag{1}$$

which assigns to every unite tangent vector $v \in T_x\Omega$ the center of the corresponding Larmor circle. Varying unite vector v in $T_x\Omega$, for a fixed point $x \in \Omega$, the corresponding Larmor centers form a circle of radius r centered at x, and the domain swept by all these circles, when x runs over Ω, we shall denote by Ω_r:

$$\Omega_r = \mathcal{L}(\Omega).$$

Vice versa, one can prove that for any circle of radius r lying in Ω_r its center necessarily belongs to Ω.

For Birkhoff magnetic billiard we always choose a counterclockwise orientation of $\partial\Omega$. Moreover, for any smooth piece γ of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ we define two curves as follows. Fix an arc-length parameter s of positive orientation, we set:

$$\gamma_{+r}(s) = \mathcal{L}(\gamma(s), \tau(s));\ \gamma_{-r}(s) = \mathcal{L}(\gamma(s), -\tau(s)), \tag{2}$$

where $\tau(s) = \dot\gamma(s)$. It is easy to see that, $\Omega_r \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain in the plane homeomorphic to the annulus and the curves $\gamma_{\pm r}$, called parallel curves to γ, lie on the boundary $\partial\Omega_r$. Here γ_{-r} lies on the outer boundary of the annulus, and γ_{+r} lies on the inner boundary. Other pieces of the boundary of $\partial\Omega_r$ are circular arcs of radius r with the centers at the corners of the boundary $\partial\Omega$, but they will not play any role for us in the sequel.

Remark 2. The curves $\gamma_{\pm r}$ are also called equidistant curves, or fronts, in Singularity theory, or offset curves in Computer Aided Geometric Design see [16], [17].

One easily computes the curvature of the parallel curves to be

$$k_{+r} = \frac{k(\gamma)}{r\cdot k(\gamma) - 1}; \quad k_{-r} = \frac{k(\gamma)}{r\cdot k(\gamma) + 1}.$$

So the curvature of the inner boundary k_{+r} and the outer boundary k_{-r} always satisfy the bounds:

$$k_{+r} > \beta, \quad 0 < k_{-r} < \beta, \tag{3}$$

showing in particular, that any circle of radius r with the center at $\gamma(s)$ on γ is tangent to the outer boundary from inside at $\gamma(s) - rJ\dot\gamma(s)$ and to the

inner boundary from outside at the point $\gamma(s) + rJ\dot{\gamma}(s)$. Moreover, apart from these tangencies this circle remains entirely inside Ω_r (see Fig. 2).

By the definition $\mathcal{L}$ has constant value on every Larmor circle so the components of $\mathcal{L}$ are integrals of magnetic flow g^t inside Ω.

Moreover, we introduce the mapping $\mathcal{M} : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$ by the following rule: Let C_-, C_+ are two Larmor circles centered at P_-, P_+ respectively. We define

$$\mathcal{M}(P_-) = P_+ \iff C_- \quad \text{is transformed to} \quad C_+,$$

after billiard reflection at the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

With this definition $\mathcal{M} : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$ preserves the standard symplectic form in the plane, and thus Ω_r naturally becomes the phase space of magnetic billiard. We shall call $\mathcal{M}$ Magnetic billiard map. Notice that on the boundaries $\gamma_{\pm r}$, map $\mathcal{M}$ acts identically, while on the connecting circles of the boundary corresponding to the corners of Ω, map $\mathcal{M}$ is not defined.



Fig. 2 Circle of radius r centered at $\gamma(s)$ is tangent to $\partial\Omega_r = \gamma_{+r} \cup \gamma_{-r}$.

Given a polynomial integral $\Phi = \sum_{k+l=0}^{N} a_{kl}(x) v_1^k v_2^l$ of the magnetic billiard we define the function $F : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$ by the requirement:

$$F \circ \mathcal{L} = \Phi. \tag{4}$$

This is a well defined construction since Φ is an integral of the magnetic flow so has constant values on any Larmor circle. Moreover, since Φ is invariant under the billiard flow, it follows that F is invariant under billiard map $\mathcal{M}$:

$$F \circ \mathcal{M} = F.$$

In coordinates the definition (4) reads:

$$F(x_1 - rv_2, x_2 + rv_1) = \Phi(x, v) = \sum_{0 \le k+l \le N} a_{kl}(x) v_1^k v_2^l. \tag{5}$$

Notice, that since Φ is a polynomial in v, then function F satisfies the following property: F restricted to any circle of radius r lying in Ω_r is a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most N. Next Theorem claims that in such a case F is a polynomial function:

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω_r be a domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ which is the union of all circles of radius r whose centers run over a domain Ω (for example the whole $\mathbb{R}^2$). Let $F : \Omega_r \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function on Ω_r such that F being restricted*

to any circle of radius r of Ω_r is a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most N. It then follows that F is a polynomial in x, y of degree at most $2N$.

Proof of this theorem uses Lemma 2.1 whose elegant proof was communicated to us by S.Tabachnikov. Proofs of the lemma and Theorem 1.2 are given in Section 2.1. Notice that if one allows r to be arbitrary in Theorem 1.2 then the fact would be obvious, however the result holds true when r is fixed.

The next Corollary immediately follows from the Theorem and the relation (5):

Corollary 1.3. *Coefficients of the integral Φ are polynomials in x, y of degree at most $2N - (k + l)$.*

Recall that the coefficients of integral Φ are assumed to be continuous on the closure of Ω, therefore it follows from the very construction of the function F that it extends continuously to the boundary $\partial\Omega_r$ and hence by Theorem 1.2, F coincides with a polynomial on $\overline{\Omega}_r$.

Moreover, we will prove the following:

Proposition 1.4. *Suppose that the magnetic billiard in Ω admits a polynomial integral Φ and let F be the corresponding polynomial on $\overline{\Omega}_r$. Then for every smooth piece γ of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ it follows that*

$$F|_{\gamma_{\pm r}} = const.$$

Remark 3. Given a smooth piece γ of the boundary one can assume that polynomial integral F of $\mathcal{M}$ is such that the *constant* in the Proposition is 0, for both parallel curves $\gamma_{\pm r}$. Indeed if $F|_{\gamma_{-r}} = c_1$ and $F|_{\gamma_{+r}} = c_2$, one can replace F by $F^2 - (c_1 + c_2)F + c_1 \cdot c_2$ to annihilate both constants c_1, c_2. In terms of the integral Φ this means that on γ one can assume that:

$$\Phi(x, \pm\tau) = 0,$$

for every point $x \in \gamma$ and τ a unite tangent vector to γ at x.

We shall prove Proposition 1.4 in Section 2

Proposition 1.4 and the Remark 3 imply:

$$\gamma_{\pm r} \subset \{F = 0\},$$

and thus $\gamma_{\pm r}$ is contained in the algebraic curve $\{F = 0\}$. This fact implies then that γ itself is also algebraic. We shall denote in the sequel the minimal defining polynomial of the irreducible component in $\mathbb{C}^2$ containing $\gamma_{\pm r}$ by $f_{\pm r}$ respectively. Since the curves $\gamma_{\pm r}$ are real $f_{\pm r}$ are with real coefficients. Notice, that it may happen that both $\gamma_{\pm r}$ belong to the same component, so that $f_{+r} = f_{-r}$. For instance this happens for the case of parallel curves to γ when γ is ellipse [6], [16], [17]. In this case $f_{-r} = f_{+r}$ is the irreducible polynomial of degree 8.

1.4. **Main result and Corollaries.** We turn now to the formulation of our main result:

Theorem 1.5. *Let Ω be a convex bounded domain with a piece-wise smooth boundary, such that every smooth piece of the boundary has curvature at*

least, β. Suppose that the magnetic billiard in Ω admits a Polynomial integral Φ. Then the following alternative holds: either $\partial\Omega$ is a circle, or every smooth piece γ of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ is not circular and has the property that affine curves $\{f_{\pm r}=0\}$ are smooth in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Moreover, any non-singular point of intersection of the projective curve $\{\tilde{f}_{\pm r}=0\}$ in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with the infinite line $\{z=0\}$ away from isotropic points $(1:\pm i:0)$ must be a tangency point with the infinite line. Here $\tilde{f}_{\pm r}$ is a homogenization of $f_{\pm r}$.

Corollary 1.6. *For any non-circular domain Ω in the plane, the magnetic billiard inside Ω is not algebraically integrable for all but finitely many values of β.*

Proof. Indeed, $f_{\pm r}$ depends on r as polynomial function, so $f_{\pm r}$ is a polynomial in x, y and r. Moreover, since every piece γ has positive curvature bounded from below by β, then there is an open interval $\frac{1}{r} \in (k_{\min}; k_{\max})$ where one can claim using differential geometry argument that γ_{+r} does have singularities. Hence, the system of equations

$$\partial_x f_{+r} = \partial_y f_{+r} = f_{+r} = 0$$

defines in $\mathbb{C}^3$ an algebraic curve and its projection on r-line is Zariski open set. It then follows that singularities persist for all but finitely many r. □

It may happen that refining our method below one can prove that the only magnetic billiard admitting polynomial integral is circular. But this is out of reach at present moment.

Remark 4. Our main result implies in particular that if one of the arcs of magnetic billiard is circular then only the circle is algebraically integrable. This is in contrast to the zero magnetic field case where there exist polygons such that billiard flows admit polynomial integrals (see [12]).

Corollary 1.7. *Let Ω be an interior of the standard ellipse:*

$$\gamma = \left\{ \frac{x^2}{a^2} + \frac{y^2}{b^2} = 1 \right\}, \quad 0 < b < a.$$

Then the for magnetic field of all magnitudes $0 < \beta < k_{\min} = \frac{b}{a^2}$ magnetic billiard in ellipse is not algebraically integrable.

Proof. The equation of the parallel curves for ellipse is the following (see for instance [6]):

$$a^8(b^4+(r^2-y^2)^2-2b^2(r^2+y^2))+b^4(r^2-x^2)^2(b^4-2b^2(r^2-x^2+y^2)+(x^2+y^2-r^2)^2)$$
$$-2a^6(b^6+(r^2-y^2)^2(r^2+x^2-y^2)-b^4(r^2-2x^2+3y^2)-b^2(r^4+3y^2(x^2-y^2)+$$
$$r^2(3x^2+2y^2)))+2a^2b^2(-b^6(r^2+x^2)-(-r^2+x^2+y^2)^2(r^4-x^2y^2-r^2(x^2+y^2))+$$
$$b^4(r^4-3x^4+3x^2y^2+r^2(2x^2+3y^2))+b^2(r^6-2x^6+x^4y^2-3x^2y^4+r^4(-4x^2+2y^2)+$$
$$r^2(5x^4-3x^2y^2-3y^4)))+a^4(b^8+2b^6(r^2+3x^2-2y^2)+(r^2-y^2)^2(-r^2+x^2+y^2)^2-$$
$$2b^4(3r^4-3x^4+5x^2y^2-3y^4+4r^2(x^2+y^2))+2b^2(r^6-3x^4y^2+x^2y^4-2y^6+$$
$$2r^4(x^2-2y^2)+r^2(-3x^4-3x^2y^2+5y^4)))=0.$$

It turns out to be irreducible. Moreover the parallel curves $\gamma_{\pm r}$ have singularities in the Complex plane for every $r > \frac{1}{k_{\min}} = \frac{a^2}{b} > b$ as follows:

$$(0, \pm\frac{\sqrt{b^2-a^2}\sqrt{a^2-r^2}}{a}),\ (\pm\frac{\sqrt{a^2-b^2}\sqrt{b^2-r^2}}{b}, 0).$$

Therefore the result follows from Theorem 1.5. □

1.5. **Outer magnetic billiards.** It is remarkable that the action of billiard map $\mathcal{M}$ coincides with, what we call Outer magnetic billiard. In addition, the result which we get by our method provides the extension of Theorem by Tabachnikov [19] to the case of Outer magnetic billiards.

Let us introduce Outer magnetic billiard in a natural way. Let Γ be a smooth convex curve in the plane with a fixed orientation (not necessarily counterclockwise). Let $\beta > 0$ be the magnitude of the magnetic field. Given a point P outside Γ we define $T(P)$ as follows: Consider the Larmor circle of radius $r = \frac{1}{\beta}$ starting from P tangent to Γ at $\Gamma(s)$ with the agreed orientation at $\Gamma(s)$ and then define $T(P)$ to lie on the same Larmor circle so that the arcs $(P;\Gamma(s))$ and $(\Gamma(s);T(P))$ have the same angular measure.

Notice that there are two different cases:

1) In this case the orientation on Γ is clockwise then T is well defined for any $\beta > 0$ (see Fig. 3).



Fig. 3 Outer billiard map $P \to T(P)$ for clockwise orientation on Γ.

2) However, if the orientation on Γ is counterclockwise then T is well defined for $0 < \beta < k_{min}$ (see Fig. 4).



Fig. 4 Outer billiard map $P \to T(P)$ for counterclockwise orientation on Γ.

Remark 5. In fact in the second case one can allow that Γ is C^1-smooth curve which is piece-wise C^2, having arcs of radius r interlaced between non-circular C^2 pieces.

In both cases 1) and2) the domain where the Outer billiard map T is defined is the annulus A bounded by Γ and Γ_{+2r} (see Figure 3, 4). We call the dynamical system T the Outer magnetic billiard. It is not hard to check that T is a symplectic map of the Annulus A. Next theorem shows that Outer magnetic billiard T in the case 2) is in fact isomorphic to Birkhoff magnetic billiard $\mathcal{M}$:

Theorem 1.8. *Magnetic billiard map $\mathcal{M} : \Omega_r \to \Omega_r$ (defined in subsection 1.3) coincides with Outer billiard T determined by the inner boundary γ_{+r} of Ω_r, endowed with a counterclockwise orientation.*

Indeed, let P_-, P_+ be the centers of two Larmor circles C_-, C_+ such that C_- is reflected to C_+ at the point Q of the smooth part γ of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Then it follows from the definition of reflection law, that the circle of radius r with the center in Q oriented counterclockwise passes from P_- to P_+ and is tangent γ_{+r} at the point $P = \mathcal{L}(Q, \tau(Q))$ (see Fig. 5, 6 for two different configurations of C_- and C_+).



Fig. 5 Arcs $(q; Q)$ and $(Q; p)$ belong to C_- and C_+.



Fig. 6 Arcs $(q; Q)$ and $(Q; p)$ belong to C_- and C_+.

Remark 6. Let us remark, that the map T in the case 1) (see Figure 3) is not isomorphic to Magnetic Birkhoff billiard globally, by topological reasons. This can be seen already for the case when Γ is a circle. Indeed the difference between rotation numbers of two boundaries Γ, Γ_{+2r} equals 0 for case 1) and

equals 2π in case 2). Nevertheless, since our method below is concentrated near the boundaries it applies for both cases 1) and 2).

Let F be a polynomial which is invariant under T. As before we shall call F polynomial integral. Then similarly to the Birkhoff magnetic billiard we have that Γ, Γ_{+2r} lie in $\{F = const\}$ and therefore are algebraic (similarly to Proposition 1.4). Our result for outer magnetic billiards reads:

Theorem 1.9. *Assume that there exists a non-constant Polynomial F such that F is invariant under Outer billiard map T. Let f, f_{+2r} are irreducible defining polynomials of Γ, Γ_{+2r}. Then the following alternative holds. Either Γ is a circle, or the curves $\{f = 0\}, \{f_{+2r} = 0\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^2$ are smooth with the property that any non-singular intersection point of the projective curves $\{\tilde{f} = 0\}, \{\tilde{f}_{+2r} = 0\}$ in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ (here $\tilde{f}$ is a homogenization of f) with the infinite line $\{z = 0\}$ which is not an isotropic point $(1 : \pm i : 0)$, must be a point of tangency.*

Corollary 1.10. *The outer magnetic billiard for ellipse is not algebraically integrable.*

Proof. For the case of ellipse the curve $\{\tilde{f} = 0\}$ is smooth everywhere in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ and intersects transversally the infinite line in two points away from the isotropic points. Thus Theorem 1.9 implies non-existence of polynomial integral. □

Exactly as in Corollary 1.6 we have the following:

Corollary 1.11. *For all but finitely many values of the magnitude of magnetic field β, the Outer magnetic billiard of Γ is not algebraically integrable unless Γ is a circle.*

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 2.1. In Section 3 we deal with the boundary values of the integral F. In Section 4 we derive a remarkable equation on F. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.5. The proofs of Theorem 1.9 and Corollary 1.11 are completely analogous and therefore are omitted.

Acknowledgements

The first named author is grateful to Eugene Shustin and Misha Sodin for very useful consultations. We thank Sergei Tabachnikov for communicating to us elegant proof of Lemma 2.1.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We shall use the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let F be a C^∞ function $F : A \to \mathbb{R}$ where*

$$A = \{(x, y) : (r - \delta)^2 \leq x^2 + y^2 \leq (r + \delta)^2\},$$

is the annulus in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Suppose that the function F being restricted to any circle of radius r lying in A is a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most N. It then follows that F is a polynomial in x and y of degree at most $2N$.

Proof. (after S. Tabachnikov). We shall say that F has property P_N if the restriction of F to any circle of radius r lying in A is a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most N. The proof of Lemma goes by induction on the degree N.

1) For $N = 0$, Lemma obviously holds since if F has property P_0 then F is a constant on any circle of radius r and hence must be a constant on the whole A, because any two points of A can be connected by a union of finite number circular arcs of radius r.

2) Assume now that any function satisfying property P_{N-1} is a polynomial of degree at most $2(N-1)$.

Let F be any smooth function on A of property P_N. Denote by C_0 be the core circle of A, i.e. $C_0 = \{x^2 + y^2 = r^2\}$, and let F_0 be the polynomial in (x, y) of degree N satisfying $F|_{C_0} = F_0|_{C_0}$. Then, one can find a C^∞ function $G : A \to \mathbb{R}$ so that

$$F(x,y) - F_0(x,y) = (x^2 + y^2 - r^2)G(x,y), \quad \forall (x,y) \in A. \tag{6}$$

(This can be proven with the help of "polar" coordinates on A

$$(x,y) \to (u,v);\ u = x^2 + y^2 - r^2,\ v = \arg(x + iy),$$

applying Hadamard' lemma to the function $F - F_0$ with respect to the variable u and v being the parameter.) Let us show now that G has property P_{N-1}. Then by induction we will have that G is a polynomial of degree $2(N-1)$ and thus by (6), F is a polynomial of degree $2N$ at most. We need to show that the function $g := G|_C$ is a trigonometric polynomial of degree $(N-1)$ or less, for any circle C of radius r in A . With no loss of generality we may assume that the circle C is centered on the $x-$axes (otherwise apply suitable rotation of the plane). Then

$$C = \{(x,y) \in A : (x-a)^2 + y^2 = r^2\}, \quad |a| < \delta.$$

Substituting $x = a + r\cos t, y = r\sin t$ into (6) we have

$$(F - F_0)|_C = (a^2 + 2ar\cos t) \cdot g.$$

Writing the left and the right hand side in Fourier series we get

$$\sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f_k e^{ikt} = a(a + re^{it} + re^{-it}) \sum_{-\infty}^{+\infty} g_k e^{ikt},$$

where f_k are Fourier coefficients of $(F - F_0)|_C$. Moreover, we have:

$$f_k = 0, \quad |k| > N,$$

since both F, F_0 have property P_N. Thus we obtain linear recurrence relation for the coefficients g_k:

$$rg_{k+1} + ag_k + rg_{k-1} = 0, \quad |k| > N.$$

The characteristic polynomial of this difference equation

$$\lambda^2 + \frac{a}{r}\lambda + 1 = 0$$

has two complex conjugate roots $\lambda_{1,2} = e^{\pm i\alpha}$ and therefore we get the formula:

$$g_{N+l} = c_1 e^{il\alpha} + c_2 e^{-il\alpha}, \quad l \geq 2,$$

where

$$c_1 + c_2 = g_N, \quad c_1 e^{i\alpha} + c_2 e^{-i\alpha} = g_{N+1}.$$

It is obvious now that if at least one of the coefficients g_N or g_{N+1} does not vanish, then at least one of the constants c_1, c_2 does not vanish and therefore the sequence $\{g_{N+l}\}$ does not converge to 0 when $l \to +\infty$. This contradicts the continuity of g. Therefore both g_N, g_{N+1} must vanish and so g is a trigonometric polynomial of degree at most $(N-1)$, proving that G has property P_{N-1}. This completes the proof. □

Next we give the proof of Theorem 1.2.

Proof. Take any circle of radius r lying in Ω_r and let A be the annulus which is the closure of its $\delta-$neighborhood. Using the convolution with a C^∞ mollifier ρ_ϵ compactly supported in a small disc of radius ϵ, we get a C^∞ function F_ϵ :

$$F_\epsilon(z) := \int \rho_\epsilon(z-\xi)F(\xi)d\xi = \int F(z-\xi)\rho_\epsilon(\xi)d\xi, \quad z = (x,y).$$

It is easy to see, that if F has property P_N then also F_ϵ has property P_N on the chosen annulus A for all ϵ small enough, $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Then by Lemma 2.1, F_ϵ must be a polynomial on A of degree at most $2N$, for $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$. Recall, that F_ϵ converge to F uniformly on A as $\epsilon \to 0$. Therefore, since the space of Polynomials of degree at most $2N$ is finite-dimensional it then follows that F is also a polynomial on A of degree at most $2N$. The set Ω_r can be covered by annuli like A, therefore F must be a polynomial of degree at most $2N$ on the whole Ω_r. This completes the of Theorem 1.2.

□

3. **Boundary values of the Integral**

We prove now Proposition 1.4

Proof. Take a point Q on a smooth piece γ of the boundary $\partial\Omega$. Let $\tau(Q)$ be a positive unite tangent vector to γ. Let C_-, C_+ be the incoming and outgoing circles with the unite tangent vectors v_- and v_+ at the impact point Q. We are interested in the two cases when the reflection angle between τ and v_- or between v_- and $-\tau$ is close to zero. These two possibilities correspond (see Fig. 5, 6) to the following cases:

$$(a) \qquad v_- = R_{-\epsilon}\tau, \qquad v_+ = R_\epsilon \tau;$$
$$(b) \quad v_- = R_\epsilon(-\tau), \quad v_+ = R_{-\epsilon}(-\tau),$$

where R_ϵ is the counterclockwise rotation of the plane on a small angle ϵ. On Figures 5,6 the arcs $(q;Q)$ and $(Q;p)$ are the arcs of the circles C_- and C_+ respectively.

We define

$$P_-(\epsilon) = \mathcal{L}(Q, v_-) = Q + rJ(v_-); \quad P_+(\epsilon) = \mathcal{L}(Q, v_+) = Q + rJ(v_+).$$

In the case (a) we have

$$P_-(\epsilon) = Q + rJ(R_{-\epsilon}\tau); \quad P_+(\epsilon) = Q + rJ(R_\epsilon \tau). \tag{7}$$

As for the case (b):

$$P_-(\epsilon) = Q - rJ(R_\epsilon \tau); \quad P_+(\epsilon) = Q - rJ(R_{-\epsilon}\tau). \tag{8}$$

On the Figures 5, 6 we abbreviate

$P_- := P_-(\epsilon),\ P_+ := P_+(\epsilon), P_0 := P_-(0) = P_+(0)$.

Notice that in case (a) the middle point of the short arc connecting points $P_-(\epsilon)$ and $P_+(\epsilon)$ is the point $P_0 = P = (Q + rJ\tau) \in \gamma_{+r}$ and for the case (b) the middle point is $P_0 = (Q - rJ\tau) \in \gamma_{-r}$ (see Fig. 5, 6).

The condition 2. of Definition 1.1 reads in terms of F:

$$F(P_-(\epsilon)) = F(P_+(\epsilon)) \tag{9}$$

Differentiating this equality with respect to ϵ at $\epsilon = 0$ and using the fact that $\frac{d}{d\epsilon}|_{\epsilon=0} R_\epsilon = J$ we compute in the case (a):

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}|_{\epsilon=0} F(P_-(\epsilon)) = dF|_{P_0}(-r \cdot \tau),$$

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon}|_{\epsilon=0} F(P_+(\epsilon)) = dF|_{P_0}(r \cdot \tau).$$

Here $dF|_{P_0}(w)$ is the differential of the function F at the point P_0 applied to the vector w. Thus (9) implies that

$$dF|_{P_0}(\tau) = 0,$$

where in the last formula τ should be understand as the unite tangent vector to γ_{+r} at the point P_0 proving the claim in case (a). The case (b) is completely analogous. This proves that

$$F|_{\gamma_{\pm r}} = const.$$

□

4. **Remarkable equation**

For any function F which is invariant under $\mathcal{M}$ we can rewrite equation (9) at any non-critical point $P_0 \in \gamma_{\pm r}$ as follows.

Denote by $n = J\tau$ the unite normal vector. From formulas (7) we have for the case (a):

$$P_\pm(\epsilon) = Q + rJ(R_{\pm\epsilon}\tau) = Q + rR_{\pm\epsilon}n = \tag{10}$$

$$= Q + rn - r(n - R_{\pm\epsilon}n) = P_0 - r(I - R_{\pm\epsilon})n.$$

Analogously for the case (b) we get from (8):

$$P_\mp(\epsilon) = Q - rJ(R_{\pm\epsilon}\tau) = Q - rR_{\pm\epsilon}n = \tag{11}$$

$$= Q - rn + r(n - R_{\pm\epsilon}n) = P_0 + r(I - R_{\pm\epsilon})n.$$

Notice that for the unite normal to the curves γ_{+r} and γ_{-r} at P_0 one has $n = \pm\frac{\nabla F}{|\nabla F|}$ where the sign is irrelevant since we can change the sign of F. Using this remark we can rewrite the equation (9) with the help of (10),(11) in both cases (a) and (b) simultaneously:

$$F\left(P_0 + r(I - R_\epsilon)\left(\frac{\nabla F}{|\nabla F|}\right)(P_0)\right) - \tag{12}$$

$$F\left(P_0 + r(I - R_{-\epsilon})\left(\frac{\nabla F}{|\nabla F|}\right)(P_0)\right) = 0, \quad P_0 \in \gamma_{\pm r}.$$

This can be written for $P_0 = (x, y) \in \gamma_{\pm r}$ explicitly:

$$F\left(x + r\frac{F_x(1-\cos\epsilon) + F_y \sin\epsilon}{|\nabla F|}; y + r\frac{F_y(1-\cos\epsilon) - F_x\sin\epsilon}{|\nabla F|}\right) - \tag{13}$$
$$F\left(x + r\frac{F_x(1-\cos\epsilon) - F_y \sin\epsilon}{|\nabla F|}; y + r\frac{F_y(1-\cos\epsilon) + F_x\sin\epsilon}{|\nabla F|}\right) = 0.$$

The next step is to expand equation (13) in power series in ϵ. The coefficient at ϵ^3 reads:

$$(F_{xxx}F_y^3 - 3F_{xxy}F_y^2F_x + 3F_{xyy}F_yF_x^2 - F_{yyy}F_x^3) + \tag{14}$$
$$3\beta(F_x^2 + F_y^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(F_{xx}F_xF_y + F_{xy}(F_y^2 - F_x^2) - F_{yy}F_xF_y) = 0, \quad (x, y) \in \gamma_{\pm r}.$$

Remarkably, the left-hand side of (14) is a complete derivative along the tangent vector field v to $\gamma_{\pm r}$, $v = (F_y, -F_x)$, of the following expression which therefore must be constant:

$$H(F) + \beta|\nabla F|^3 = const, \quad (x, y) \in \gamma_{\pm r}, \tag{15}$$

where we used the notation

$$H(F) := F_{xx}F_y^2 - 2F_{xy}F_xF_y + F_{yy}F_x^2.$$

Let us remark that the equation (13) and therefore also (15) is valid only for those points, where ∇F does not vanish. If the polynomial F is reducible this never happens. Therefore we proceed as follows. Let us denote by f_{+r} irreducible defining polynomial of γ_{+r}, the proof for the curve γ_{-r} is completely the same. Then we have:

$$F = f_{+r}^k \cdot g,$$

for some integer $k \geq 1$, and polynomial g not vanishing on γ_{+r} identically. Given an arc of γ_{+r} where g does not vanish we may assume it is positive on the arc (otherwise we change the sign of F). Moreover, since f_{+r} is irreducible polynomial, then we may assume that ∇f_{+r} does not vanish on the arc. Therefore the equation (15) can be derived in the same manner for the function $F^{\frac{1}{k}} = f_{+r} \cdot g^{\frac{1}{k}}$ which obviously is invariant under the map $\mathcal{M}$ exactly as F is. Thus we have

$$H(f_{+r} \cdot g^{\frac{1}{k}}) + \beta|\nabla(f_{+r} \cdot g^{\frac{1}{k}})|^3 = const, \quad (x, y) \in \{f_{+r} = 0\}. \tag{16}$$

Using the identities which are valid for all $(x, y) \in \{f_{+r} = 0\}$

$$H(f_{+r} \cdot g^{\frac{1}{k}}) = g^{\frac{3}{k}}H(f_{+r}), \quad \nabla(f_{+r} \cdot g^{\frac{1}{k}}) = g^{\frac{1}{k}}\nabla(f_{+r}),$$

we obtain from (16):

$$g^{\frac{3}{k}}(H(f_{+r}) + \beta|\nabla f_{+r}|^3) = const, \quad (x, y) \in \gamma_{+r}. \tag{17}$$

Raising to the power k back we get:

$$g^3(H(f_{+r}) + \beta|\nabla f_{+r}|^3)^k = const, \quad (x, y) \in \gamma_{+r}. \tag{18}$$

Next we claim the following

Proposition 4.1. *The constant in equation (18) cannot be 0.*

Proof. Recall the formulas for the curvature k of the curve defined implicitly by $\{f_{+r} = 0\}$:

$$\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\nabla f_{+r}}{|\nabla f_{+r}|}\right) = \frac{H(f_{+r})}{|\nabla f_{+r}|^3} = \pm k_{+r}. \tag{19}$$

Now we take any point on γ_{+r} and substitute into (18). This gives that the constant must be non-zero. Indeed, if the *const* is zero, then

$$\frac{H(f_{+r})}{|\nabla f_{+r}|^3} = -\beta.$$

Then by formulas (19) we have

$$k_{+r} = \pm\beta.$$

But this is not possible, because we have the bounds on the curvature of parallel curves (3). □

5. **Proof of the Main Theorem 1.5**

In this section we finish the proof of Theorem 1.5. We start with the following:

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that magnetic billiard in Ω admits a non-constant polynomial integral Φ. If at least one piece of the boundary is a circular arc, then $\partial\Omega$ is a circle.*

Proof. Let us recall that for circular magnetic billiard there exists a simple integral given by Example 1. It is very convenient to pass from Φ to F defined as above:

$$F \circ \mathcal{L} = \Phi.$$

Let us recall that the mapping $\mathcal{L}$ maps any unite vector (x, v) to the center of the Larmor circle passing through x in the direction of v. So that if (Q, v_-) is reflected into (Q, v_+) then the points $P_\pm = \mathcal{L}(v_\pm)$ lie on the circle of radius r which is tangent to the curves γ_{+r} and γ_{-r} at the points $\mathcal{L}(Q, \tau)$ and $\mathcal{L}(Q, -\tau)$ which are the middle points of the two arcs of the circle connecting P_-, P_+ (see Figures 5,6).



Fig. 7 Arcs $\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(1)}_{+r}, \gamma^{(1)}_{-r}$ belong to C, C_{+r}, C_{-r}.

Consider two pieces of $\partial\Omega$: $\gamma^{(1)}$ is an arc of the circle C of radius d, and $\gamma^{(2)}$ is the adjacent piece. Consider also the annulus bounded by the two concentric circles of C_{-r} of radius $(d+r)$ and C_{+r} of radius $(r-d)$ (see Fig.

7). Let us consider together with the given magnetic billiard another one acting inside the circle C. So the annulus between the two concentric circles of C_{-r} and C_{+r} is the phase space of magnetic billiard inside the circle C.

We claim that the polynomial function F must have constant value on every circle concentric with C. To show this we denote by (ρ, ϕ) the polar coordinates centered at the center of these circles. In these coordinates the mapping $P_- \to P_+$ corresponding to circular billiard reads:

$$\rho(P_+) = \rho(P_-); \quad \phi(P_+) = \phi(P_-) + \alpha(\rho), \tag{20}$$

where the function α is

$$\alpha(\rho) = 2 \arccos\left(\frac{\rho^2 + d^2 - r^2}{2\rho d}\right). \tag{21}$$

It follows from (21) that this function is analytic in the annulus between the two circles, $r - d < \rho < d + r$. Consider now the function

$$\Delta(x, y) := F(P_-) - F(P_+),$$

where P_- has coordinates (x, y) and coordinates of P_+ are determined according to (20) and (21). It follows from the analyticity of function α and polynomiality of F that the function $\Delta(x, y)$ is analytic on the open annulus $r - d < \rho < d + r$. Furthermore, since F is built via the integral Φ for the billiard inside Ω and $\gamma^{(1)}_{\pm r} \subset C_{\pm r}$ then Δ vanishes on an open subset of the annulus, and therefore must vanish identically on the annulus. This fact together with denseness of invariant circles with irrational rotation numbers for the map (20), yields that polynomial F has constant values on every concentric circle passing inside the annulus, and therefore on every concentric circle in the plane (not necessarily inside the annulus). This proves the claim.

Suppose now that the adjacent piece $\gamma^{(2)}$ does not lie on the circle C. This implies then that $\gamma^{(2)}_{+r}$ necessarily intersects an open set of concentric circles. On every circle F has a constant value by the claim above, and F also is a constant on $\gamma^{(2)}_{+r}$, by Proposition 1.4. Therefore F must be a constant on an open set and hence everywhere, contrary to the assumptions. This completes the proof. □

Now we are in position to finish the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Proof. Consider now the equation (18) in $\mathbb{C}^2$. It follows from (18) and Proposition 4.1 that the curve $\{f_{+r} = 0\}$ has no singular points in $\mathbb{C}^2$, since at singular points both $H(f_{+r})$ and $\nabla(f_{+r})$ vanish. Moreover, consider now in $\mathbb{C}P^2$ with homogeneous coordinates $(x : y : z)$ the projective curve $\{\tilde{f}_{+r} = 0\}$. We shall denote homogeneous polynomials corresponding to f, g by $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}$ respectively. Then the homogeneous version of (18) for $(x : y : z) \in \{\tilde{f}_{+r} = 0\}$ reads:

$$\tilde{g}^3 \left(z \cdot H(\tilde{f}_{+r}) + \beta((\tilde{f}_{+r})^2_x + (\tilde{f}_{+r})^2_y)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^k = const \cdot z^p. \tag{22}$$

Here the power $p = 3 \deg g + 3k(\deg f_{+r} - 1)$ must be positive unless the degree of the polynomial f_{+r} and of F is one. But this is impossible, due to

our convexity assumptions. Let Z be any point of intersection of $\{\tilde{f}_{+r}=0\}$ with infinite line $\{z=0\}$. Then by (22) for such a point we have two relations

$$(\tilde{f}_{+r})_x^2+(\tilde{f}_{+r})_y^2=0, \quad x(\tilde{f}_{+r})_x+y(\tilde{f}_{+r})_y+z(\tilde{f}_{+r})_z=x(\tilde{f}_{+r})_x+y(\tilde{f}_{+r})_y=0.$$

But these two relations are compatible only in the two cases: either

$$x^2+y^2=z=0, \quad or \quad (\tilde{f}_{+r})_x=(\tilde{f}_{+r})_y=0.$$

This completes the proof. □

References

[1] Berglund, N., Kunz, H. *Integrability and ergodicity of classical billiards in a magnetic field.* J. Statist. Phys. 83 (1996), no. 1–2, 81-126.

[2] Bialy, M. *On totally integrable magnetic billiards on constant curvature surface.* Electron. Res. Announc. Math. Sci. 19 (2012), 112-119.

[3] Bialy, M., Mironov, A.E. *Angular Billiard and Algebraic Birkhoff conjecture.* arXiv 1601.03196

[4] Bialy, M., Mironov, A.E. *Algebraic Birkhoff conjecture for billiards on Sphere and Hyperbolic plane.* To appear in J. Geom. Phys. arXiv 1602.05698.

[5] Bolotin, S. V. *Integrable Birkhoff billiards.* (Russian) Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. 1990, no. 2, 33-36

[6] Farouki, R.T., Neff, C. A. *Algebraic properties of plane offset curves. Curves and surfaces in CAGD '89* (Oberwolfach, 1989). Comput. Aided Geom. Design 7 (1990), no. 1–4, 101-127.

[7] Gutkin, B., Smilansky, U., Gutkin, E. *Hyperbolic billiards on surfaces of constant curvature.* Comm. Math. Phys. 208 (1999), no. 1, 65-90.

[8] Gutkin, B. *Hyperbolic magnetic billiards on surfaces of constant curvature.* Comm. Math. Phys. 217 (2001), no. 1, 33-53.

[9] Gutkin, E. *Billiard dynamics: a survey with the emphasis on open problems.* Regul. Chaotic Dyn. 8 (2003), no. 1, 1–13.

[10] Gutkin, E., Tabachnikov, S. *Billiards in Finsler and Minkowski geometries.* J. Geom. Phys. 40 (2002), no. 3–4, 277-301.

[11] Kozlov, V.V., Polikarpov, S.A. *On periodic trajectories of a billiard in a magnetic field.* (Russian) Prikl. Mat. Mekh. 69 (2005), no. 6, 942–949; translation in J. Appl. Math. Mech. 69 (2005), no. 6, 844–851 (2006).

[12] Kozlov, V.V., Treshchev, D.V. *Billiards. A genetic introduction to the dynamics of systems with impacts.* Translated from the Russian by J. R. Schulenberger. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 89. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991.

[13] Kozlova, T.V. *Nonintegrability of a rotating elliptic billiard.* (Russian) Prikl. Mat. Mekh. 62 (1998), no. 1, 87–91; translation in J. Appl. Math. Mech. 62 (1998), no. 1, 81–85.

[14] Maciejewski, A.J., Przybylska, M. *Integrability of Hamiltonian systems with algebraic potentials.* Phys. Lett. A 380 (2016), no. 1-2, 76–82.

[15] Robnik, M., Berry, M.V. *Classical billiards in magnetic fields.* J. Phys. A 18 (1985), no. 9, 1361-1378.

[16] Sendra, J.R., Sendra, J. *Algebraic analysis of offsets to hypersurfaces.* Math Z. 234 (2000), no. 4, 697-719.

[17] San Segundo, F.; Sendra, J.R. *Partial degree formulae for plane offset curves.* J. Symbolic Comput. 44 (2009), no. 6, 635-654.

[18] Tabachnikov, S. *Remarks on magnetic flows and magnetic billiards, Finsler metrics and a magnetic analog of Hilbert's fourth problem.* In Modern dynamical systems and applications, 233-250, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[19] Tabachnikov, S. *On algebraically integrable outer billiards.* Pacific J. Math. 235 (2008), no. 1, 89-92.

[20] Tasnadi, T. *The behavior of nearby trajectoriies in magnetic billiards.* J. Math. Phys. 37 (1996), no. 11, 5577-5598.

M. Bialy, School of Mathematical Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Israel
E-mail address: bialy@post.tau.ac.il

A.E. Mironov, Sobolev Institute of Mathematics, Novosibirsk, Russia
E-mail address: mironov@math.nsc.ru